

REMARKS

Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of April 10, 2008 be extended three months, from July 10, 2008 to October 10, 2008.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee and any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 20 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all of the claims.

Claim Objections

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 1-20 for various informalities. Applicant has amended the claims in a manner that applicant believes overcomes these objections. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to claims 1-20.

The §112 Rejection

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims in a manner that the applicant believes overcomes these rejections. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 11-12, 14-15, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,092,100 to Berstis et al.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis and further in view of Robinson et al., “Relationship of Telex Answerback Codes to Internet Domains,” RFC 1394, January 1993, and rejected claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010859 to Hitson et al. On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-8 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0038456 to Hansen et al. On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis and further in view of TLD Sponsorship Agreement: Attachment 13 (.museum), October 16, 2001.

The Present Invention

The present invention is a method of handling a request from a browser for a web page, the request including a URL with a specified TLD, an end-user entering the URL into the browser URL line, comprising the steps of: (a) determining whether the URL entered into the browser URL line matches a web page that exists for that specified TLD; (b) if there is no match to a web page, then, instead of treating the URL as unresolvable, providing for a domain name server to automatically direct the browser to at least one web site and not to provide an error

message; in which the specified TLD is a typographical error entered by the end-user as a ccTLD instead of a .com or a.net TLD.

The Cited Prior Art Does Not Anticipate the Claimed Invention

The MPEP and case law provide the following definition of anticipation for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §102:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) M.P.E.P. §2131.

The Examiner Has Not Established a *Prima Facie* Case of Anticipation

Bertis describes a system in which, if an ambiguous domain name is entered by an end-user, then a fuzzy search is performed to attempt to match it to an existing web page. If the fuzzy search generates a match, then a web browser is automatically launched (steps 56 and 60; also 68 and 72). But if there is no sufficiently good match, then various candidate URLs are displayed so that the user can select the correct one. If the user declines to select a candidate URL, then an error is shown (71 and 82).

Claim 1 of the present invention has been amended to make it explicitly clear that, if the user-entered URL does *not match* a web page, then, instead of treating the URL as unresolvable, a domain name server automatically directs the browser to at least one web site. The domain name server does not provide an error message.

Bertis neither teaches nor suggests this. Where there is no sufficient match in Bertis, there is no automatic direction of the browser to a web site. Instead, as noted above, the system

displays candidate URLs (65 and 76) from which a user can manually select a desired URL. If no selection is made, then an error is displayed.

So in Bertis there are no circumstances in which a failure to match the user defined URL to a web page *automatically* leads to a web site being opened, as required by Claim 1 and as set forth in slightly different wording in independent claim 11.

Bertis instead proceeds on the assumption that if its fuzzy search algorithm has failed to locate a match, then the best that can be done is to offer the user various candidate guesses for the end-user to review and select if appropriate. It would not be obvious to modify Bertis to automatically display a web site when there is no match, because doing so would subvert the primary intent of Bertis, which is to *only* display a web site when there *is* a good enough match.

The remaining references cited by the Examiner neither teach or reasonably suggest the elements missing from Bertis as detailed above. Accordingly, for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 11, the remaining claims patentably define over the prior art.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §§102 and 103.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to applicant's Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

Respectfully submitted

October 9, 2008
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP
Centre Square West
1500 Market Street, 38th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189
Telephone: 215 972 7880
Facsimile: 215 972 4169
Email: MSimpson@saul.com